Hon, CASSIUS M. CLAY of Ky.

Defore the Yeung Men's Republican Union, at the Cooper Institute, New-York, Feb. 15, 1860.

GENTLEMEN OF THE REPUBLICAN UNION: I re tern you my sincere thanks for the honor you confer upon me to-night, and the thanks of our party and the country for your activity, and fidelity, to the " principles of Republicanism, which were virtually vinpeople of the Union.

I come up to this metropolis of the Republic in spirit of personal elation. Here is the seat of comnerce. Here center all the interests of agriculture and napufactures, and here is the sun of that intellectual light which, through the press, daily flashes over the entinent from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Allah! il Allah to the Freedom of Speech and the Press.

For more than twenty years, relying upon these divine agencies, more powerful than cannon or the the Union of these States. Thank God I have lived see the dewnfall of their enemies and the triumph of their friends. James Buchsnan was placed in power by a new conferred fraud upon the ballot-box, and by an admitted minority of the popular vote. In vain did he trample under foot the avowed "popular sovereignty" of the Cinsinnati Platform: the Republicans of Kansas proved too powerful for Government patronage, public purse, and the Federal sword! not" a Slace," but a Free State. The elections since show a regular advance of Republicanism in all the States; and the election of a Republican Speaker in the popular branch of the National council, proclaims the downfall of the Slave Power-which has so long desecrated the name Democrats—to rise no more for

When I had the honor last to address you, in 1856, I ventured to say that as " our party had not been advarced by success, so it would not be set back by defeat." What was speculation in 1856 is history in 1860. Many supposed that the President, from his antecedents and advancing age, would break away from the trammels of party, and be just and conservative. I was not one of them. I remembered the Os tive. I was not one of them. I remembered the Os-tend Manifesto, the pledges which he made to Senator Brown of Mississippi and others, and knew well that the Cincinnati Platform of non-interference with Slave-ry in the Territories would give way under Southern pressure. The Slave Oligarchy began by asking neu-wality in the national Constitution and Government. then equality with Freedom, and at last supremacy.
take up the review where I left off in 1856.

DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM OF 1852.

DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM OF 1852.

"That Congress has no power under the Constitution to interfere with or control the domestic institutions of the several flates, and that such States are the sole and proper judges overy thing appertaining to their own affairs, not preliabiled by the Constitution; that all efforts of the Abelitionists, or others, made to induce Congress to interfere with questions of Slavery, are to take incipient steps in relation thereto, are calculated to ladd to the most alarming and dangerous consequences."

What say you to that, Democrats? Although you declared in black and white that it was dangerons to interfere with the subject of Slavery, what have you done? Did you not say it was dangerous to interfere? Answer me that, and let me go on? You are silent. You are condemned out of your own mouths. I proceed:

med:

"And that all such efforts have an inevitable tendency to summing the happiness of the people, and endanger the stability and permanency of the Union."

You condemn yourselves again:

"And ought not to be countenanced by any friend of our political institution."

tical institutions."

"And, therefore, the Democratic party of the Union, standing apon their National platform, will abide by and adher to a faithment of the acts known as the Compromise Measures, settled by the last Compress—the act for reclaiming of fagitives from service or labor included—which act, being designed to earry out the express provision of the Constitution, cannot be repealed or so changed as to destroy or impair its efficiency."

"Recolected, That the Democratic party will resist all attempts

These were the declarations and avowals of the These were the deckrations and avowals of the Democratic party in 1852. Now, what do they do in 1854? Why they go under the leadership of Stephen A. Douglas, when he had made a report, saying that the law of 1820 was acredly conserved in the compremise of 1850, and repeal the Missouri Compromise. Now, I believe, they stand condemned by their own acts, and I have here accemplished what I proposed to do.

THE DEMOCRACY SELF-CONDEMNED.

What was the result of all this I The result was that, in obedience to the declaration that the people were to be fairly left to choose for themselves between Liberty and Slavery, they adopted another platform. Let me come to that. I will tell you what they did in 1856—in that year the Cincinnati Platform was adopted.

In consequence of the repeal of the Missouri Compremise, the Northern people intervened to get their own Territory, upon the avowal made in the Kansas-Nebrasks bill that the people were to "be left free to "form and regulate their domestic institutions in their "own way, subject only to the Constitution of the "United States." But notwithstanding that avowal it made, they immediately, as the report of the United it made, they immediately, as the report of the United States Congress showed you, before a single Free-Soiler or Republican had set his foot into the new Territory, commenced on the border of Missouri the organization of the "Blue Lodges" to invade Kansas, with the avowed design—peaceably if they could, and foreibly if they must—to have that land for a Slave State; and "dams the Abolitionists, they would shoot them down as squirrels," as I heard a leading Democrat express himself in Lexington, while that conflict was going on. They passed these resolutions in 1856, and I want you to pay a strict attention to these, in comparison with the other avowals:

DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM OF 1856.

"Resolved, That we reiterate with renewed energy of purpose, the well-considered declarations of former Conventions upon this sectional lasse of Domestic Slavery, and concerning the reserved rights of the States."

That alludes to the former Democratic Platferm of 1852, four years before. It goes on:

That alludes to the former Democratic Platferm of 1852, four years before. It goes on:

"1. That Congress has no power under the Constitution to incufers with or control the domestic institutions of the several States, and that all such States are the sole and proper judges of every thing appertaining to their ows sflairs, not prohibited by the Constitution; that all efforts of the Abelhiconists or others, and the induce Congress to interfere with questions of Statesy, or take incipient steps in relation thereto—the very thing they have been desing to-day, beside which we have heard them demanding every man that does not come up their standard, and assing every man that does not come up their standard, and assing every man that stands on the "Squatter Soveneignty". Platform outside of the Democratic party—are calculated to lead to the most alarming and dangerous consequences; and that all seals of our fact that the seals of the democratic party—are calculated to lead to the most alarming and dangerous consequences; and that all seals of our political institutions.

"2. That the foreign proposition covers, and was intended to embries, the whole subject of Slavery agritation in Congress; and therefore the Democratic party of the Union, standing on this metionly platform, will abide by and adhere to a faithful execution of the acts known as the Compromise measures settled by the Congress of 1850, "the act for realisming fuglives from services or abor included, which act, being designed to carry out an express prevision of the Constitution, cannot with facility these to be repealed, or so changed as to destroy or impair its abolency."

2. That the Democratic party will resist all attempts at re-

"Deleticy," The the Democratic party will resist all attempts at re-newing, in Congress or out of it, the agitation of the Slavery question, under whatever above or color the attempt may be stade."

question, under whatever abape or color the attempt may be made."

Oh yee! will resist! That is the Democratic doctrine in 1856 in Cincinnati. Die you allude to it in your late Kentucky Convention! Yes, you voted down "that the Democratic party will resist all attempts at renewing, in Congress or out of it, the agitation of the Savery question, under whatever shape or color the attempt may be made." What do you say to that? There is the Cincinnati platform which you seehew to-day. You denounced as treasonable any attempt what agitation under any shape whatever. Let me, however, turn to another clause:

"4. That by the uniform application of this Democratic principle to the organization of territories, and to the admission of new States, with or without domestic Slavery, as they may elect, the equal rights of all the States will be preserved intact, the original compacts of the Constitution maintained inviciate, and the perspectify and expansion of the Union learned to its utmost capacity of embracing, in page and harmony, every future American State that may be constituted or amezod, with a republican Ret you omit."

pearly of chibbonic, in pace and an anexed, with a republican sorm of Government."

But you omit "2. Resolved, That claiming fellowship with, and desiring the cooperation of all who regard the preservation of the Union ander the Constitution as the paramount face, and repudiating all sortional partisan platforms concerning Domestic Slavery, which sock to embroit the States and to inside to treason and around resistance to law in the Territories, and whose avowed purposes, if consummated, must end in civil wer and dissolution the American Democracy recognize and adopt the principle contained in the organic laws establishing Kamas and Nebrack Territories, as embodying the only cound and afte solution of the Slavery question upon which the great national data of the people of this whole country can repose in it determined conservations of the Union—non-intervention by Congress in State and Territory or in the Dirictlet of Columbia."

POPULAR SOVEREIGNEY VOTED DOWN.

The resolutions of Mr. Graves in the Kentucky Con-

The resolutions of Mr. Graves in the Kentucky Con-vention, indorving these resolutions, were almost unanimously vota d down! While affecting to renew the platform of 1856, they entirely ignore that clause which bound the Democracy not to interfere, directly or indirectly, with Sizvery in the States or Territories; not only that, but they a chared that Douglas, in stind-ing thus, was guilty of treason and outside of the Democratic party.

THE UNMADE ISSUE.

Well now, gentlemen, I am going to give clause that if they had adopted it would he put the catch you; if you give us Down as we would catch you; if you give us Toombs a would catch you; and if you offered Breckinrida we would catch you. They did not intend the emocratic party to a preacher, a man of great good sense but little or no education, would asy when reading the Bible, "Well, brethren, this is one will skip it."

The Democratic party found it was a bad place, and skipped it, that it is no wonder they did not want me to see party found it was a bad place, and skipped it, that it is no wonder they did not want me to see that it is no wonder they did not want me to see that it is no wonder they did not want me to see that same Hall, and that the lights were out, and it was all dark. Here is what they did.

Republican, nor Abolition party, nor the Democratic party, has ever made an issue upon the resolution passed, and which was in the platform of 1856. It is simply as to the power of the prople when they become a State. It is a solf-evident truth, and they intend you to go home with it, with the thought that you bagged the game, but you will find that the lion has gone, and that you have put but the ass's skin into your pt uch.

"Resolved, That we recognize the right of the people of the Territories, including Kanssa and Nebraka, acting through the

"Resolved, That we recognize the right of the people of the Territories, including Kansas and Nebraska, acting through the legally and fairly expressed will of a majority of actual residents, at d whenever the number of their inhabitants justifies it, to form a Constitution, with or without domestic Slavery, and be admitted into the Union upon terms of perfect equality with the other States."

How frank that is! "with or without domestic How frank that is! "with or without domestic Slavery, and be admitted into the Union upon terms of perfect equality with the other States." Who ever de-nied that! I challenge Mr. Silvertooth, I challenge Oscar Turner, or even Mr. Speaker Merriwether, or any Democrat here, to point me out a single resolution, from the foundation of our Government to this day, in any portion of the United States, where such has been denied! If there is such, my reading has been of no

Take the case now. I have read the platforms and shown they are inconsistent. But let me tell you what was the clause in the Kansas-Nebraska bill which they affirmed again and again. It states that the Democratic party determined "neither to legislate Slavery into those Territories"—Oh, no, of course not—"nor to exclude it therefrom." What are you to do, then? "But to leave the people perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States." Now, what do you think of that? Did not intend to legislate Slavery into Kansas, nor to exclude it; but did intend to leave the people perfectly free to form and regulate their government in their own way? Is that your doctrine te-day? Editor of The Yezman, did you publish it in that way, that the object of the Nebraska bill was intended to leave the people perfectly free to regulate their own domestic institutions in their own way? They say in the resolutions they have adopted that the people shall not do any such thing, and if Douglas goes for any such doctrine, we will see him d—d if he remains in the Democratic party; and Mr. Silvertooth declares he is already ont of the pale of the Democratic church. [A voice—'The whole Democratic party is not responsible for him."] Of course not! God forbid they should be. [Laughter and applause.] The great mass of the Republican party is of the Democratic party, but they are of the good old American gold, with the stamp of 1776, not the bogus Democratic stamp of 1854 and 1856. They are with us now, and will be with us hereafter, and therefore I stand here, and the lights are not put out. THE KANSAS-NEBRASKA BILL

out.

THE SNAKE AND ITS SKIN.

Let us trace the consequences: Like the snake, yearly they shed their skin, but they never go back into the old one; beautiful it is at first, but it immediately returns to dust and ashes. Let us look at the consequences. Here was the formation of the "Blue Lodges" in Missouri, according to the Congressional Report—remember I don't intend to give any statement upon my own say so; I appeal to history to substantiate all I say. You march under your Missouri hordes so formed into the Territory of Kansas; and although it is well known, as history has proven, that the Republican party was in a clear majority, by force of arms you took down the Judges of Elections that were appointed legally. They were taken by force, the Missouri forces going out with banners flying and with arms displayed, and the question asked was not "Are you a Judge according to the Constitution and the laws?" Not "Are you a Judge of Election carrying out the declaration of the Cincinnati Plat forms of 1852 and 1856, that the people should determine upon their domestic institutions in their own was?" But "Are you sound on the goose!" That was what they asked them; in other words, "Are you for Slavery?" Not "Are you right on the goose!" and if a man did not answer the way that pleased them, they caught him by the collar and ejected him, and many who upheld the constitutional right of election were compelled to fly for their lives, and many were wounded and killed. Where then stood the Democratic press of the United States? Aiding and abetting all this treason. The free-soil citizen from the State, who had seen by actual experiment the glorious benefits of free institutions, and others who had seen the wee of Kentucky, as well as he from the Free States, who had seen by actual experiment the glorious benefits of free institutions, and others who had seen the woe of Slavery, and who found that the pledges of the Democratic party had been kept to the word, and violated in fact late in the day sent to their homes, both in Kentucky, the Slave and the Free States, for help, and took up arms, and upon every field, and by the whole power that God and nature had bestowed upon them, they resisted the attempt to enslave them. What then did the President of the United States! All the time he, by the forces of the United States, disarmed the Republican party, and left them at the mercy of those invaders of their rights.

JOHN BROWN AND HIS RAID.

Then sprung up this John Brown. I say he is the

JOHN BROWN AND HIS RAID.

Then spring up this John Brown. I say he is the legitimate son of the acts and avowals of the Democratic party, that they intended to take possession of Kansas by force of arms, "peaceably if they could, but forcibly if they must;" and it was only when those descendants of Revolutionary fathers took up arms in their own defense—and I thank God there were Kentuckians as well as Yankees fighting there in that battle for Freedom—that they drove back the invader, and now a great and overwhelming majority of the people of Kansas say that it shall be free, not-withstanding James Buchanan lifts up his impious of the people of Kansas say that it shall be free, hot-withstanding James Buchanan lifts up his impious hands, and, perhaps, praying that it may be so, says that "Kansas is as much a Slave State as South Caro-lina." Is that Democracy? In the name of that God lina." Is that Democracy? In the name of that Got to whom he so impicusly appeals, is it so—is it a Slave State? Not at all. History tells us that just there be gan John Brown. How it is I will state, as it comes gan John Brown. How it is I will care, to me authenticated. To the best of my knowledge and belief, before he shed the blood of a single man, and belief, before he shed to blood it olders in cold blood, and belief, before he should be a large and one of his sons was chopped to pieces in cold blood, and another son was dragged in chains by a vehicle until from the heat, the exposure, the ignominy, and the torture of his chains, his brain was crazed, and he went mad; and his sister, looking upon all these sad calamities and scenes of horror, was also nntil from the heat, the exposure, the ignominy, and the torture of his chains, his brain was crazed, and he went mad; and his sister, looking upon all these ead calamities and scenes of horror, was also crazed. Then this man took up the knife, and made a war of extermination upon the slaveholders and the invaders of the soil. There is the secret of the whole matter, as I stand here to-night—the beginning of this raid on Virginia. John Brown felt that there was no protection for him in the Democratic party—that the laws of Missouri and Kansas gave no protection to him, and that he had once more to appeal to the God of Hosts for defense, and he carried that war on in Kansas, and in Missouri, and Virginia. The whole story is told; it was nothing but the raid of a man injured by aggressions made upon him, and these proved to have been begun and com leted by the Democratic party themselves. Therefore, I hail back the imputation, and history will stand by the record. That is all of it. The calumnics of unturiated partisanship will prove in the sequel peisoned shafts returning upon their projectors. The Investigating Senatorial Committee will establish our innoconce, and consign our accusers to maxified in form.

hish our innoconce, and coneign our accusers to merited infamy.

INDECTMENT AGAINST THE REPUBLICANS. The Democratic party makes against us, through the Vice-President of the United States, ten formal allega-

tions. He says:
"I charge that the present and alterior purposes of the Repub-

tions. He says:

"I charge that the present and ulterior purposes of the Republica party and:
"To introduce the doctrine of negro equality into American politics, and to make it the ground of positive legislation, hostile to the Southern States;
"To exclude the slave property of the South from all territory now in the Union, or which hereafter may be acquired;
"To prevent the admission in any latitude of another slave holding State;
"To repeal the Englitive Slave law, and graphically refuse to obey the Constitution on that subject;
"To repeal the Englitive Slave law, and graphically refuse to obey the Constitution on that subject;
"To refuse to present or punish by State action the spellation of slave property, but en the contrary, to make it a criminal citients in the lateral three states are staying the property in African slaves;
"To should be stay in the District of Columbia;
"To should be the interactional and coastwise trade;
"To should him whate Congress has exclusive intradiction;
"To think, harms, and frown upon the institution in every mode of political action, and by every form of public opinion;
"And finally, by the Executive, by Congress, by the postal service, the press, and in all other accessible medes, to agitate without coasing, until the Southern States, without sympathy or botherhood in the Union, warm down by the unequal struggle, shall be compelled to surrender ignominiously and emancipate their slaves."

Now, gentlemen, these are allegations formally put forth. It is not for us to question the notives of the man who makes them, but I take the allegations as I fird them, and I shall attempt to answer them in detail. First of all, I appeal to the country and history. Stand og here upon our recorded action, and the integrity of ur previous character, I plend not gu'lty of the harges; not guilty on every count except one—to that

I plead guilty.

NEGRO EQUALITY SET AT REST. First, we are not guilty of the purpose to introduce the doctrine of negro equality into American politics, and to make it the ground of positive legislation, bostile to the Southern States. Mark, the crime is here, that we have been guilty of "introducing." Now it is well known, so far as common rumor goes—we can got always to the state of t that we have been guilty of "introducing." Now it is well known, so far as common rumor goes—we cannot always judge of the motives of men—that the Dred Scott case was gotten up by agreement; in advance of legislation, but subsequent to the declaration of the purpose of the Democratic party, to take possession of Kansas. We did not want any such subject introduced into politics. Why! Because there was already odium enough attached to us as being the defenders of the rights of the negro against the white man. We were called already "negro-lyvers," and it was not to our interest to get up an issue of this kind, if we desired so to do. But an agreed case was made, as is reported in Howard's Reports. The case came up to the Supreme Court of the United States from the United States District Court of Missouri, and although I am a follower of the plow, and although he has perhaps studied law all his life, I declare that John C. Breckinridge does not understand it. I think I can present it so that a man of the commonest understanding can comprehend it.

g can comprehend it.

I will state the substance of the thing. I will state the substance of the thing. It was a suit brought by a man of color, called Dred Scott, first in the State Coarts of Missouri, where it was decided that Scott was free, then going up, I think, to the Supresse Court of Missouri, where the decision was reversed and sent back. It was taken to the Circuit Court; the pleadings were to this extent: a plea of a batement was made—Dred Scott bringing an action declaring that, vi et armis, one Sandford had a plea of soutement was made—Dred Scott bringing an action declaring that, vi et armis, one Sandford had assaulted him, and also Harriet Scott, his wife, and children. To this Sandford, who is also upon the record, admitted to be, I know not if in reality, a citizen of New-York, pleaded in abatement, that Dred Scott and his wife and children were his slaves, and that being slaves, or rather, to quote the language as used in the pleadings, that he was the descendant of African slaves, a man of color, a negro, and therefore he could not be a citizen of the United States; and Sandford called upon the Court to throw the case out of Court; that they had no jurisdiction, and that he (Sandford) should hold, as master, Dred Scott.

So far as the Dred Scott decision became a law of the United States, it is simply thus, that after the case was

So far as the Dred Scott decision became a law of the United States, it is simply thus, that after the case was twice argued in the Supreme Court of the United States, a majority, standing five to two, of the Justices, decided that a man of African blood, descended from parents once slaves, could not be a citizen of the United States, and therefore, the Court having no jurisdiction, it was returned, with instructions to sustain the Circuit Court. That is what they decided. Now, I desire to state that, in my humble judgment, Dred Scott was not the slave of Sandford, and being a free man of color, according to the Constitution of the United States, when it was made, he had a right to see, and had a right to be reto the Constitution of the United States, when it was made, he had a right to sue, and had a right to be relieved from the existence of vict armis—to be free; and that was the opinion of Justices McLean and Curtis. And every lawyer that has read the decision of the Court in Howard's Reports, that I have spoken to upon the subject, has invariably said to me, that the opinion of Justice Curtis is the most conclusive piece of logic ever presented in all the books of judicial decisions. I have it at home, and I declare that in my judgment, there is no proposition in Euclid more clearly demonstrated than that. Not that Dred Scott had a right to citizenship—to hold office and vote—rights which many white no proposition in Euclid more clearly achievated than that. Not that Dred Scott had a right to citizenship—to hold office and vote—rights which many white persons, as for instance women, have not, but that he had a right to the protection afforded by law; that being a free man, by being carried first into a Free State, and then to the territory ceded to the United States by France, he had a right to sue and be sued. He never declared that Scott was entitled to all the privileges of a citizen, but the Constitution says:

"The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all the privileges of its own and be sued. He never declared that Scott was entitled to all the privileges of its own state shall be entitled to all privileges and imm unities of citizens in the several States."

And if Kentucky determines that the black man cannot hold office in the Common wealth, a black man coming from Massachusetts cannot hold office; he is but entitled to the protection of the laws given for the security of his own race and condition.

The Dred Scott decision was gotten up entirely by the Democratic party, and it was made in 1856, after the election of President Buchanan, and intended to surtain the Kansas-Nebraska bill.

In passing, allow me to say that we make no issue with the Supreme Court on that subject. We acknowledge the Supreme Court on that subject. We acknowledge

with the Supreme Court on that subject. We acknowledge the Supreme Court decision to be the law of the land, and deny the allegation that we intend illegally and factionally to resist the decision of that Court, and force a kind of citizenship upon the country with which we have nothing to do. So far, then, for the Dred Scott decision.

OBITER DICTA.

Gentlemen, time passes quickly, and of course I cannot go elaborately into the argument upon the other part of that which is claimed to be the decision in the Dred Scott case—that is, that the law of 1787, first passed by the Confederation of States, and recuacted by the House of Representatives at its very first session under the Constitution in 1789, was unconstitutional. That is the dictum of these five Judges. Well, now, gentlemen, just let me state one or two strong points, that every man of common sense can understand. It is the practice of all Courts—Courts of Common Law and Courts of Equity of the United States, and of all the Courts of reason, justice and common sense on earth, from the earliest time to the latest day, that when questions come up for decision, they decide the main question, and that other dicta, that is, words spoken incidentally, and not to the main question, are not law. There are Democratic lawyers that hear me to night, and they will bear me out in this statement, and it is right. There are just reasons for it, because, the attention of the Jadges being bound to the main issue, they must not be held responsible for the incidental questions of the case. Now, that is what Justices McLean and Curtis tell us, and they are, in my opinion, the ablest Judges upon the Bench. I think Justice Curtis the ablest Judges to the case after the read after. OBITER DICTA. in my opinion, the ablest Judge I ever read after, and he tells us that when the Supreme Court decided in the case that it had no jurisdiction, then their whole power ceased. That is what this Judge tells us, that is what the Bepublicans say, that is what the Republicans say, that is what every honest man, unbiased by political associations and considerations, must say. I say it, gentlemen, that in my humble judgment the rest of the opinion is not law, and in this I am supported by some of the very ablest judicial minds of the United States. Not only so, but Justice Curtis shows that the Supreme Court has decided, again and again, that obiter dicta are not law, and are not so to be considered. There are decisions in that report quoted, absolutely made to the effect that these incidental decisions that come in are not part of the law of the land. Therefore we say, in denial of what the Democratic party has said, that it is not the law of the land. Therefore we go upon that subject, not for changing, but rather we deny that it is law, in my opinion, the ablest Judges upon the Bench what the Democratic party has said, that it is not the law of the land. Therefore we go upon that subject, not for changing, but rather we deny that it is law, and we appeal to the country to decide between us. We owe no allegiance to it as to a law of the United States, but it is yet open for free discussion by the people, that they may determine it under the Constitution of the United States. To so much we plead guilty. POWER OF CONGRESS OYER THE TERRITORIES.

Now, as this is an eventful question, let us dwell a little upon it. What were the terms of the confederalittle upon it. What were the terms of the confederation in regard to it? Before it ceded these territories to the United States, it declared that it
yielded to them entire jurisdiction, practical and political, and they did "so nominate it in the Bond!" The
framers of the Constitution of 1789 use this language.
"The Congress shall have power to dispose of and
make all needful rules and regulations respecting the
territory or other property of the United States." And
in practice they exercised the whole power. Now
here are combined all the most potent data of logical
exposition:—1. The intention. 2. The language. 3.
The practice: eight and sux-fourteen times did they give the lie to the pretended dictum of the five
Judges, that Congress has no power to eject Siavery
from the Territories. from the Territories.

THE WORDS "RULES AND REGULATIONS."

They deny this positive grant of power by Congres o prohibit Slavery in the territories, upon the assertion that the word Regulation is not a common term used by legal men when they intend to confer a political power. That is the argument of the Supreme Court. Let us look at that. Four times is the word "regulation" used in the Constitution with regard to grants of power, and thus, so far from being an unusual term, it was a usual one in the disposition of power in the United States. Another clause says, that Congress shall have nower to "regulate commerce." Does any shall have power to "regulate commerce." Does any Democrat deny that that is a legislative power t What, under it, have they done? Toey not only "regulate commerce" under it, between foreign countries and this, regulating foreign and domestic trade, but they pass the embargo. Why? Because they had the power to make all needful rules and regulations appertaining thereto. In the Territories they have similar power, delegated in somewhat the same words. Not only had they the power to chorish commerce but they only had they the power to cherish commerce, but they bad a right to prohibit and destroy commerce itself. Certainly that is a legislative power; and it was exer-cised under this very term "regulate;" therefore it is absolutely absurd when the Supreme Court and the absolutely absurd when the Supreme Court and the Democratic party undertake to say that when it was enacted that Congress should have the power to make all needful rules and regulations for the Territory, they did not delegate legislative power; so that the very language that they claim would debar a grant of power, is shown by four clauses of the Constitution to carry with it that very legislative power; it even extending to the taking of life, liberty, and property. Don't they say in the Constitution that they shall have the power! Such was the understanding of the old framers of the Federal Constitution, of the old Confederation—of the Insmers of the act of 87, and alfederation of the framers of the act of 87, and al-though the Supreme Court are bound to acknowledge federation—of the Inamers of the act of 8, and al-though the Supreme Court are bound to acknowledge that all the territory acquired previous to the forma-tion of the Constitution was subject to the control of Congress, they come to the conclusion that the Consti-tution did not intend to confer the power at all, but that its very exercise was prohibited by the Consti-

Gentlemen, there was a portion of these lands, when the Constitution was formed, intended to be seded, and it was known by the framers of the Constitution that it was to be ceded. Georgia and North Carolina afterward ceded their territory for the same reason that Virginia ceded lilinois and Indiana, and left Congress "all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory and other property of the United States." How then can the Court deny the power to act over future cessions; while admitting the power over those already ceded before 1789? Where is the intent—where the limitation in language—where the practice—where the common sense to sustain such an assumption of political power on the part of the Court? No, it is a usurpation by the Judiciary power of legislative action, contrary to the Constitution of the United States, and in overthrow of the liberties of the people. HOW HE CHANGED AN OPINION.

States, and in overthrow of the herites of the people.

HOW HE CHANGED AN OPINION.

I always believed, until I read the opinion of Justice Curtis, with the old Free-Soil party, that, under the Constitution of the United States, you could not establish Slavery in any Territory. I do now confess that, after reading the decision of Justice Curtis, that it was after reading the decision of Justice Curtis, that it was so clear, and the argument so irresistible, that they could practice legislation in either way, that I was bound to acknowledge that the power to prohibit also carried with it the power to establish, and the converse, that the power to establish Slavery also gave the power to prohibit it. I therefore yielded up my old opinion I know not what others may do), because in this dicta of Justice Curtis, if Congress has power simply because there is no limit put upon it, it has power on either side; that is, it has omnipotent sovereign power, although this is a Government in general of limited nower insurance as the Constitution does not limit powers, inasmuch as the Constitution does not limited Congress in establishing or abolishing Slavery. The power is not denied by the Constitution, therefore it has it.

well, now, it is at last brought to this: Congress has the right to establish or abolian Slavery in the Territories. It is, then, a matter upon which we appeal to the country for decision. Will you go for Slavery, or Freedom? I believe that to be the doctrine of the Republican party, and that is the whole sum and substance of the controversy between us. We say, with Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Henry, Lee, Adams, and Sterman, at dall the distinguished fathers of the Republic, not that Slavery is a blessing and a Divine institution, and all that, but we admit it to be an evil, morally, socially, and politically, and a weakness in the Commonweaith, and therefore we go against it, wherever we can constitutionally reach it.

SLAVERY A WEAK INSTITUTION.

institution, and all that, but we admit it to be an evil, morally, socially, and politically, and a weakness in the Commonwearth, and therefore we go against it, wherever we can constitutionally reach it.

SLAVERY A WEAK INSTITUTION.

Why is it that John Brown spread such consternation through all Virginia! Are we to believe that the Virginians are all cowards! No! There is in Virginia just as gallant blood as flows in the world. It was eimply because Slavery was a weak institution from the beginning to this time, that it was what James Madison told South Carolina and Georgia; it is because Slavery is what Mr. Randolph told &fr. Everett. We tell you that it is a source of weakness in the State, and therefore, as patriots, and lovers of our country, we say to the several States, enjoy your institution as long as you choose, but so far as we are responsible we go against it all the time. There is the whole front of our oflending. Is it not right?

THE ADMISSION OF SLAVE STATES.

Another charge made is, that we purpose "to prevent the admission, in any latitude, of another slave-holding State." I deny that that is the platform of the Republean party, as made up in 1850, a set it is to be made up in 1860, and if you will allow me I will refer to the record. I cannot read all of the platform, but I give you my word there is no such clause in it. I will read one clause:

"Resoleed, That with our Republican Fathers, we hold it to be a self-evident truth, that all mes are endowed with the linalienable right to like, therety, and the pursuit of happiness, and that the primary object and alterior design of our design in the action of the constitution against all stempts to violate it for the purposes of saw it becomes our duty to maintain this provision of the Constitution against all stempts to violate it for the purposes of abilishing Slavery in any Territory, ordinate that provision of the Constitution against all stempts to violate it for the purpose of establishing Slavery in any territory, ordinate that provision o

try upon that subject.

THE SLAVE CODE CONSIDERED.

Before I pass over this I will say a few words with regard to the power that the slaveholders claim for the protection of slave property under the Constitution of the United States, because that is a vital question.

the United States, because that is a vital question.

Gentlemen, with all the inconsistency of the Democratic party in 1852 and 1856, they never thought of this thing, that blavery went, under the Constitution and by virtue thereof, into every Territory, per sc.

Never was such an expression made use of, but they all admitted that no such power existed in or under the Constitution. Hence, of course it was upporer to enact. and by virtue thereof, into every territory, per ser. Never was such an expression made use of, but they all admitted that no such po wer existed in or under the Constitution. Hence, of course, it was proper to enact that the people of a Territory were free to legislate Slavery in or out of the Territory. Now, gentlemen, the Democratic party is placed in this attitude, that if they then knew that under the Constitution and according to what they now claim to be the decision of the Supreme Court, every slaveholder has a right to go into the Territory with his property, they deceived the people to the detriment of the slaveholder when they left the matter to be decided upon by the non-elaveholders. What right had the Democratic party to say that they should confiscate the property of all the slaveholders of a Territory, and leave their property to the tender mercies of the squatters, who make their way from Germany, Ireland, China, Massachusette, and Kentucky! Mr. Brecklaridge, or some of your friends, answer me, yes or no, did you intend, when you stood in favor of l'opular Sovereignty, or Squatter Sovereignty, to confiscate all the property of the slaveholders of the United States! No, Sir. You did not think that you had the right to carry Slavery into the Territory. That is the truth of the matter. In my opinion, that is what every Democrat believed. We say that the belief was right. Why! Because all the dicta of all the jurists, from time immemorial, from Grotius to Man field—all jurists known to civilization and fame, from the earliest days to this, declared that slave were a psculiar property, unlike other property known to men. What do the best English Reports tell us! Before 1760, this was declared, and by the highest Courts of the Crown, ontside of the Honse of Lords. This was declared by Lord Mansield, with this dicta, which I shall read to you, that I may be understood—in that case when Curran grew so eloquent—when he declared that whenever a man stood upon British soil his chains fell from him, and "h

casion, and the there is a man stood upon British self in the stood redeemed, respective law. The state of Slavery is frank a nature that it is incapable of the line introduced on any reasons, moral or political, but only by positive law, which preserves its force long after the reasons occasion, and time itself from whence it was created, is estated to support it but positive law. That decision has never been questioned in this cooutry, until this new light of the Democratic party of fell upon it in the decision of the Dred Scott case in the working that the profess the Christian religion, and obey the quality imperative mandate of progressive humanity, and that was the law of this State, and of others, and it twas decided regain and again in the courts of a Louisiana, and of Mentacky, of Virginia, and of Tennessee, and in the other States of the Union, I believe, without exception, that Slavery was local, and could only exist by virtue of positive law; and when a citize of Louisiana, and it was decided regain and again in the courts of Louisiana, and it was decided read the suppense Court of the deciared free was carried to the Supreme Court of the Louisiana, and it was deciared that inasmuch as she had been carried into foreign territory she was free according to all the dicta upon the subject. "Once free and always free." It has always been held that Slavery was an institution of municipal law, and the moment the rights of humanity, and the great reason to which all law appeals, stepped in and gave freedom. All have determined in the great reason to which all law appeals, stepped in and gave freedom. All have determined in the great reason to which all law appeals, stepped in and gave freedom. All have determined in the great reason to which all law appeals, stepped in and gave freedom. All have determined in the great reason to which all law appeals, stepped in and gave freedom. All have determined in the great reason to which all law appeals, stepped in and gave freedom. All have determined in the great r

which I have laid down as being correct, save one. That one is the much talked of and moth vanned Fugitive Slave law. Let me ask you if, order the Constitution Slavery goes into the Territory of the United States, what do you want with a Fugitive Slave clause! Answer me that. Why would you not be protected in your slave property as much in any State of the Union, if it is property there, and yet, you stood in convention week after week, and month after month, and since, I might say, year after yet, contending for the rights of the slaveholding commanity to recover fugitive slaves. It was all absurd by to quarrel about a power which you assert is the Constitution. You cannot prove that the Constitution gives the power. It cannot be done. It is in vain that you struggle against the whole author by and common sense of ages.

THE SLAVE CODE CONSIDERED.

You now talk of legislative intervention by

THE SLAVE CODE CONSIDERED.

You now talk of legislative intervention by Congress to protect Slavery in the Territories. What do you want with it, if the Constitution does not give it? What right have you to it? I therefore deny, on the part of the Republican party, that there is any such power under the Constitution per se to carry Slavery into the Territories of the United States. That was not the doctrine of the Democracy of 1852 or 1856, and only after the enunciation of the Cincinnati platform, and the election of James Buchanan, did the Supreme Court screw themselves up to the point that they could say that it was law—two of the ablest and most distinguished jurists declaring that it was obiter dicta, and was no law. God grant for our freedom—every man's, white and black—that you should say in your legislative assemblies, and national conventions, and the Congress of the United States, that it is no law. As I live, it is not the law. t is not the law.

CONSEQUENCES OF THE DEMOCRATIC CLAIM.

tis not the law.

CONSEQUENCES OF THE DEMOCRATIC CLAIM.

See where it leads. Suppose they have, under the Constitution, the right to carry Slavery into the Territories, have they not a right to carry those same slaves into Ohio and New-York. You have the right to carry a cow or a horse, a coat or a watch, into New-York, and if under the Constitution Slavery is just as sacred and inviolate as this species of property, how dare Gov. Morgan say they shall not bring their slaves and take possession of the hotels of Albany, and the farms now occupied by homest freemen? I tell you why you cannot. It is because the right you assume does not exist. The Constitution says:

"This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursoance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made in pursoance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made in pursoance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made in pursoance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made in pursoance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made in pursoance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made in pursoance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made in pursoance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made in pursoance thereof, and the truited States, shall be the supreme law of the land," &c.

IS THIS A SLAVE EMPIRE?

There is the whole substance of the matter. If the Dred Scott decision is right, according to the interpretation of the Democratic party, then there is not one single foot of any but slave territory from the Gulf of Mexico to the hills of Maine. If that be true, then indeed there is no conflict going on, in the language of Seward and the Democratic party, between freedom and despotism; but the conflict is ended, and you and I, and all of us, are subject to a despotic power which is higher than the Constitutions of the States—the palladium of liberty to us. If it be see, the conflict is ended, and we are all slaves; we are subject to

the admission of any more Slave-holding States.

WHAT OF THE FUGITIVE SLAVE LAW?

The fourth charge is that we propose to repeal the Fugitive Slave law, and practically refuse to obey the Constitution on that subject. I do not deny that in some of the States there has been an effort made of that kind, but I do utterly deny that there is any such clause in the platform of 1856 or the call of 1860. Without dwelling further upon that, I pass it by, saying that I do not care to avow that I stand on that subject with Daniel Webster, the man whom, of all others in the country, we have styled the expounder of the Constitution — certainly upon Constitutional law the highest authority this country or any other. Mr. Webster, although he was over persuaded, flattered with the idea that he would get Southern support by yielding his true-born opinion, said what, in his speech of the 7th March? He said "that this was a power that belonged not to Congress, but to the several States." That is my belief; but the Republican party, desirous of harmony, yielded it, and struck it out of our platform in 1856, and do not intend to incorporate it in the platform of 1860.

OTHER CHARGES REFERRED TO.

OTHER CHARGES REFERRED TO OTHER CHARGES REFERRED TO.

"To refuse to prevent or punish by State action
the spoliation of slave property, but, on the contrary, to make it a criminal offense in their citizens to
obey the laws of the Union in so far as they protect
property in African slaves." Gentlemen, don't we
tell them in our call that we go for protecting the
rights of all the States, and, so far from hindering them in the return of their property, that we pledge our-selves as a party to defend them against your State, or selves as a party to defend them against your State, or my State, and every State, or against foreign invasion. Of conree, if we are honest in one purpose, we are honest in the other, and we cannot be honest in that avowal, if we are dishonest in the first imputation.

"To abolish Slavery in the District of Columbia." I need not read our platform again, but I defy any man to find any such a clause in it.

"To abolish it in the forts, arsenals, dock-yards, and other places in the South where Congress has exclusive jurisdiction." There is no such clause as that in the platform of 1856, or the call of 1860.

"To abolish the internal and coastwise trade."

abolish the internal and coastwise trade.

There is no such clause as that in either. There is no such clause as that in either.

"To limit, harase, and frown upon the institution in every mode of political action, and by every form of public opinion." We make a directly opposite avowal. So far from that, we not only are comform of public opinion." We make a directly opposite avowal. So far from that, we not only are compelled by the necessity of the case, but we propose, in carrying out in good faith this associated brotherhood of confederated States, not to take Emancipationists alone upon our platform, not simply to appoint them to offices, but we propose and invite slaveholders to act in conjunction with us, and to assist us in carrying out the Government, which we shall in all probability so soon control. How can this be true? How can we then intend to harass the institution by every mode of political action? Why, gentlemen, the thing is impossible in the nature of things, and unless you have proof that we are dishonest, there is no believing that we can, or desire to, monopolize all the offices in the country. We invoke that power of "public opinion, which cannot but by annihilation die," to this and all good causes. Not we, but those who are deaf to its divine admonitions, must suffer the penalty of defiance.

I stand where the Republican party stand—by the old Henry Clay Whig ground against the extension of Slavery. Let me here read what Henry Clay says upon the subject.

The Democrats have got wonderfully in love with Henry Clay of late. The old man they abused and slandered all his life, but now they come to us and say we will defend old Henry from your assaults. The man who was persecuted for a lifetime, the man who went to his grave in sorrow under the imputations made against him by these Democrats, is now taken up, and they call upon Old-Line Whige—old Clay Whige—to come out and crush out the Republicans, who stand by the doctrines of that same Clay in favor of the non-extension of Slavery. Henry Clay said, in the last year of his life, in his last term of public service, in his gray-haired old age:

"Coming as I do from a blave State, it is my solemn, deliberate and well-matured determination that no power, no carthly power, shall compel me to vice for the positive introduction of slavery, either north or south of t pelled by the necessity of the case, but we propose, in

The tenth charge or allegation is substantially embraced in the ninth, and it is not necessary that I should comment upon it.

HELPER'S CRISIS.

There is a man in Carolina whose father was born, it is said, upon North Carolina soil, and we know not how many centuries before his ancestors lived there, and it so happened that he belonged to that large class of North Carolina that may be called the working class, the non-slaveholders. He saw the influence of

testified to by F. P. Blair, esq., were expected, by the Republicans, to be stricken out in the Compend which we proposed to circulate as an elections and document—not that they were incendiary, but because it was a blunder not to be urged.

ABOUT INSURRECTIONS, While upon this subject, allow me to say a word upon the subject of insurrections. I believe I have made more speeches in vindication of the Republican party than any man in the United States, North or South. I believe, from my correspondence with individu'as, associations, and other combinations of that party, I am as intimately acquainted with the purposes of that party as any man in America, and I will tell you what I believe those purposes to be, according to my understanding, and their views with regard to this whole subject of the liberation of slaves by force, and servile insurrection.

servile insurrection.

We now and always have regarded the poor African

whole stoject of the normal of slaves by lorce, and servile insurrection.

We now and always have regarded the poor African as of an inferior race, and although we do not pretend to divine the inscrutable designs of Deity, although we cannot say what may be the design of the great "I am," whether they shall ascend in the scale of humanity, and we go down, or they go up still higher, we leave there questions entirely to the philosophical speculator, saying that is not a subject of political action at all; but so far as practicability is concerned, we say that the black man is now of an inferior race, and although the poet says "that the worm feels a pang as great as "when a giant dies," yet we believe that is all poetry and not truth. The life of man and of woman as desirable as i is elevated and removed from the condition of the beast of the field that perisheth. Therefore it is, that when Great Britain held her supremacy over the immense millions of India, attem ting by the despotic power of force, to rule it—by no amalgamation of interests taking under a common protection and into a common glory those untold millions, of Eastern men, by ruling by force; and when upon the abstract proposition, every man was bound to confess that the right was en the side of the Indian—yet my sympathies were on the side of a few fanatics there were no men among these thirty millions of people that did not sympathize with the British—the white race as against the red and colored races of India, although, as I say, the right was on the side of the East Indians. Why? Because there was this development of our race, making them little less than godlike and divine, and because, more especially, those men had proved by their brutality, when a temporary success crowned their efforts, that they were unit for liberty. The man who dares not to be generous, is not fit to rule or to be free; and we all rejoiced when we understood that the cld British Lion had rise ntriumphant over the Juggernautish flags of the people.

But we come down a p

But we come down a page lower in history, and see Hungary struggling against a superior power, for that Independence which Austria attempted to take away from her. When she fought for the God-given and national rights of independence, all this was changed. Why? Because, by the liberation of their slaves they showed that they perceived a great principle, and in this acknowledgment of a great principle, they based themselves indissolubly upon the sympathy of all the unbiased intellect of our wide-world humanity. We all wanted Hungary to triumph. We all desired her independence. So, in regard to the black race, I say here to-night that which I have said as many as ten or twelve years ago, that if that issue arose, which God forbid it should come, when the African slave and the superior race should take up arms to vindicate their liberty, which can be in no States done but by the destruction of the white or the black race, I am on the side of my own race. The solution of this problem is a fraternal one. These are the sentiments which I have always avowed. Further, I believe this to be the sentiment, so far as I know, of the members of the great Republican party of I believe this to be the sentiment, so far as I know of the members of the great Republican party o

ACCUSATIONS WITH INTEREST. My distinguished friend, John C. Breckinridge, has all his allegations answered by the record, not by my say so. But he has indulged in speculation and inference, and I intend to turn the tables on him a little

in that way.
In turn, I accuse Vice-President Breckinridge, and

in that way.

In turn, I accuse Vice-President Breekinridge, and the Democratic party, on the following counts:

First: Of obtaining and using power under false pretenses. Read their last platforms.

Second: Of false pretenses, as a Democratic party, claiming to be the special guardians and conservators of the liberty of the people, and yet ignoring those rights, and cancelling them to the overthrow of the great common law guards of freemen which secure them from the illegal search of their persons, papers, and homes. Witness gentlemen, all the reported cases of outrage made through all the Slave States from the beginning of the Government, the formation of the Constitution, and ending in the year 1860. Look to the record of all the Slave States of the Union, where outrages of this kind are not only perpetrated, but are attempted to be vindicated by the prese—outrages against which there is no redress, and none even affected to be enforced.

Third: As false in the nullification of the laws of constitutional comity. See the case of Hoar and others. See the article of the Constitution, which authorizes citizens of the several States to sue in the Federal Courte of the United States. You all know how that was.

Everth: Of violation of the treaty with Mexico.

Courts of the United States. You all know how that was.

Fourth: Of violation of the treaty with Mexico. There was war made with Mexico, while she was at peace with us, where we are told in the Report that your Gen. Taylor marched, amid men, women, and children, flying from their hearthstones, in consequence of the invasion by the United States forces.

Fifth: Of the practice of the slave-trade. Yes, gentlemen, distinguished persons in the South have boasted openly, not only that they intended to violate the laws prohibiting the slave-trade, but that they have proceeded to carry their purposes into execution, and had landed upon the Southern coasts what have and had landed upon the Southern con been notoriously acknowledged to be slaves, free from the Coast of Africa, and we have yet to learn of

the first punishment of the violation of the law. NORTHERN ALLIES OF DEMOCRACY.

been notoriously acknowledged to be slaves, fresh from the Coast of Africa, and we have yet to learn of the list punishment of the violation of the law.

NORTHERN ALLIES OF DEMOCRACY.

Here I remember to speak of those Northern allies whom the late Democratic Convention in Kentucky refused to trust. They are right. I tell you, now, they are right, and I am going to give you a little extra advice. Some slaveholders want to know how long they will stand by them. They will stand by them just as long as they pay them. The moment they seems to have possession of the Government, so soon will these allies leave them. This is the kind of men they have for Northern allies. Gentlemen, I take it that you are all men of sense, and so I put it to you here to night, if I were to get up here and say that I believed Slavery was a divine institution, and that all my previous declarations were false; that I was convinced I had been wrong, and that it was preferable to liberty, and "a religious institution favored of God," as Mr. O'Conor has said, would not every one of you put your money? You would at once say: "That man thinks to-day as he always did, and in addition to all the rascalities we have charged upon him, he is an infernal hypocrite; we will not trust him." The man who has ever seen the sanctity of the hearthstone preserved inviolate, and who has gone into some common school to receive his education, who reads his primer or his English Reader, and studies the Bible, and rises from the reading and tells you, that from his observation the condition of Slavery is the true condition of humanity, is not the man to man to make sacrifices for slaveholders or any one else. He who has seen all these things, and turns round and tells you, in the South, "I have lived under all these institutions, and I believe Slavery to be a good thing, a divine institution, that it is any source of political, social, and moral good, but I believe we had better try all chemical powers, the winds, the water, steam, electricity, all the powers of

FILLIBUSTERING.

Sixth: I charge the Democratic party with fillibustering. You all know what that me ans. Going out with armed bands of men from the United States, "extending the area of freedom," performing John Brown raids, entering upon general invasions to set humanity right. When the gallant old tar, Commodore Paulding, received instructions, if he caught Walker, to bring him home, the old fellow thought the President of the United States meant what he said; and he went, ordered his marines out, and brought home the individual—and what did the President say! "Did I not